



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,537	03/23/2004	Yehuda Shekel	06727/0201090-US0	3773
7590 D. Morgan Tench 1180 Corte Riviera Camarillo, CA 93010		03/22/2007	EXAMINER CULBERT, ROBERTS P	
			ART UNIT 1763	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/22/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/807,537	SHEKEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Roberts Culbert	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 14-32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1763

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/5/07 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/07 regarding the amended claims have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection recited below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1763

**Claims 14-26, 28, 30-32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication "In-Situ Chemical Concentration Control for Wafer Wet Cleaning" to Brause et al. in view of the publication "Quantification of Hydrofluoric Acid Species by Chemical Modeling Regression of Near-Infrared Spectra" to Thompson et al, and the publication "A Study of the Dissolution of SiO<sub>2</sub> in Acidic Fluoride Solutions" to Judge.**

Regarding Claim 14, the publication "In-Situ Chemical Concentration Control for Wafer Wet Cleaning" to Brause et al. teaches that the etching of SiO<sub>2</sub> depends strongly on temperature and HF concentration. (P 315, bottom paragraph) Brause et al. further teach that the etch rate of the SiO<sub>2</sub> may be accurately controlled by controlling HF concentration in the etching process. However, Brause et al. teach measuring conductivity to determine the concentration of HF in the etching process. Brause et al. do not teach optical detection techniques.

However, the publication "Quantification of Hydrofluoric Acid Species by Chemical Modeling Regression of Near-Infrared Spectra" to Thompson et al. teaches that electromagnetic radiation spectroscopy may be used to measure the concentration of HF species in aqueous solution. Thompson et al. further teach passing electromagnetic radiation from an electromagnetic radiation source through a liquid etchant (hydrofluoric acid), at least at two points in time, wherein said liquid etchant is operative to etch said solid; performing *ex situ* non-contact scanning detection over a predetermined spectral range (infared) of said electromagnetic radiation passed through said liquid etchant, by means of a detector (24) over said at least at two points in time so as to detect at least one change in an at least one optical property of said liquid etchant; comparing said at least one change in said at least one optical property at said at least two points in time by means of an algorithm in a processor (26) so as to provide a concentration of the etchant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use NIR measurement to measure HF concentration in the method of Brause et al. since Thompson et al. teach that the NIR technique is particularly well suited to quantification of HF over wide concentration and pH ranges such as in etching baths.

Art Unit: 1763

Brause et al in view of Thompson et al. do not expressly teach the etchant solution further comprises a byproduct species. However, the reaction between HF and SiO<sub>2</sub> produces such byproducts. For example, Judge teaches that such byproducts such as H<sub>2</sub>SiF<sub>6</sub> are produced which themselves have etching properties. The byproducts are of course taken into account by the model since spectrum data for the model is taken from samples containing the by products.

Regarding Claim 15, Thompson et al. teach that passing includes emitting electromagnetic radiation in a predetermined spectral range from an electromagnetic radiation source, transmitting said electromagnetic radiation via a first optical transmission element from said electromagnetic radiation source through a sampling element containing a sample of said liquid etchant, and conveying output electromagnetic radiation from said sample of said liquid etchant via a second optical transmission element to said detector wherein the radiation is teach a near-infrared (NIR) light source (700-1900nm).

Regarding Claim 16, Thompson et al. teach that comparing further comprises performing a chemometric manipulation on data relating to at least one change in said at least one optical property to provide the stripper concentration level.

Regarding Claims 17 and 19, Since Thompson teaches using the algorithm to determine concentration from the spectra data, and Brause teach that the etch rate correlates with concentration, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine the differential rate of change of etching using data for the change in concentration, a processor algorithm being an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding Claim 18, Thompson et al. teach that the algorithm further provides a rate of depletion of at least one chemical component of said liquid etchant over a period of time.

Regarding Claim 20, Brause et al teach a liquid etchant comprising halide ions (HF).

Regarding Claim 21, Thompson et al. teaches that passing the liquid etchant through a sampling element having a substantially transparent sampling tube.

Regarding Claim 22-24, Thompson et al. teach that the comparing step comprises converting one optical property change into a concentration rate of change of at least one chemical component of the liquid etchant.

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding Claim 25, the process limitations merely recite conventional steps for forming a calibration model from known reference data, well known in the art of data analysis using a spectrophotometer. Note that Brause et al. teach that oxide thickness measurements may be used to determine etch rates, and Thompson et al. teaches that a calibration model may be developed using a regression method and spectrum data aquired from samples irradiated with NIR.

Regarding Claim 26, Thompson et al. teach detecting a fault in a rate of addition of a replenishing chemical component.

Regarding Claims 28, the claim recites a confidence level that is inherently met by the prior art measuring procedures and instruments or else arises from essential limitations not provided for in the claims.

Regarding Claim 30, the spectral method is substantially independent of temperature.

Regarding Claim 32, Thompson et al. teach determining a concentration of HF:H<sub>2</sub>O.

Regarding Claims 34 and 35, Brause et al. teach the inorganic solid is SiO<sub>2</sub>.

**Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The publication "In-Situ Chemical Concentration Control for Wafer Wet Cleaning" to Brause et al. in view of The publication "Quantification of Hydrofluoric Acid Species by Chemical Modeling Regression of Near-Infrared Spectra" to Thompson et al. and the publication "A Study of the Dissolution of SiO<sub>2</sub> in Acidic Fluoride Solutions" to Judge, and in further view of JP 63307334 A to Nogami.**

Regarding Claims 27 and 29, Brause et al. in view of Thompson et al. teaches the method of the invention substantially as claimed but does not expressly teach detecting bubbles.

However the step is old and well known in the art of making measurements with a spectrophotometer.

For example, JP 63307334 A to Nogami teaches a method of making a detection process independent of air bubbles. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 1763

invention to use a spectrophotometer superior in sensitivity in order to prevent irregularity in the sample data in the well-known manner.

Regarding Claims 28, the claim recite a confidence level (95%) that is an inherent result of the prior art measuring procedures and instruments or else arises from essential limitations not provided for in the claims, since there are no recited manipulative differences.

**Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The publication "In-Situ Chemical Concentration Control for Wafer Wet Cleaning" to Brause et al. in view of The publication "Quantification of Hydrofluoric Acid Species by Chemical Modeling Regression of Near-Infrared Spectra" to Thompson et al. and the publication "A Study of the Dissolution of SiO<sub>2</sub> in Acidic Fluoride Solutions" to Judge, and in further view of JP 63009124 A to Nojiri.**

Regarding Claim 36, Brause et al. in view of Thompson et al. teaches the etching method of the invention substantially as claimed but does not expressly teach that the model takes into account effects of different solution circulation and flow rates.

However, as shown for example by Nojiri, it is well known in the etching art to provide circulation in an etching bath to provide a smooth and accurate etching by removing reaction products for example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a model that takes circulation and flow rates into account since such are well known in an etching bath process to affect the concentration and etch rate.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



R. Culbert  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1763